REMARKS

Applicants have canceled claims 16-25 and have amended claims 1-15 and 26 to reflect the elected subject matter. The other amendments to the claims are discussed below in the context of the Examiner's rejections.

1. The Examiner asserts that the phrase "such as" in claim 14 is ambiguous because the metes and bounds of the recited truncated derivatives cannot be delineated.

Applicants have obviated this objection by deleting the phrase "and its active truncated derivatives such as" from claim 14. Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that the phrase "pharmaceutically acceptable derivatives thereof" is not reasonably enabled by the specification for compounds of formula I.

Applicants have obviated this rejection by deleting in claim 1 the phrase "and pharmaceutically acceptable derivatives thereof" with the phrase "or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof". Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that such an amendment would obviate this rejection. Accordingly, applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

3. 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15, and 26 in part under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Applicants have obviated this rejection by replacing each occurrence of the word "comprises" with the word "containing". Accordingly, applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants request that the Examiner enter the amendments presented herein, consider the foregoing remarks, and allow the pending claims to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancakumar Govindaswamy

Reg. No. 56,285

Attorney for Applicants

Vertex Pharmaceuticals Inc. 130 Waverly Street Cambridge, MA 02139-4242

Tel.: (617)444-6467

Fax.: (617)444-6619